

Literary *Haute Cuisine* and Its Dangers

Eustathios of Thessalonike on Schedography and Everyday Language

PANAGIOTIS A. AGAPITOS

Schedography has not been a favored topic among Byzantinists since Karl Krumbacher (1856–1909) condemned it in his *History of Byzantine Literature*.¹ Among the many reasons for this condemnation some relate specifically to Krumbacher's highly innovative project of elevating vernacular Greek to a subject worthy of scholarly research.² This elevation, however, had a serious side effect because he viewed vernacular Greek (*Vulgärsprache*) as standing in linguistic and even social opposition to the prevailing learned Greek (*Kunstsprache*). For Krumbacher the peak of this opposition and the turning point for the establishment of a “written diglossia” in Byzantium was the twelfth century.³ It was then that longer texts in the vernacular began to appear, while a number of learned Byzantines expressed apparently negative opinions about everyday language, or ἰδιώτικη γλῶσσα as Anna Komnene had characterized it.⁴ Krumbacher, and many scholars after him,

instinctively equated this “everyday language” with the Greek of the *Digenis Akritis* or of the Ptochoprodromic poems, an equation that resulted in the gradual metamorphosis of these twelfth-century texts into works of Modern Greek literature. Consequently, learned and vernacular Greek texts are for the most part not studied in conjunction because of their supposed linguistic disjunction and opposition.⁵

One of Krumbacher's key figures in expressing this opposition was Eustathios of Thessalonike. On the one hand, Krumbacher viewed him as one of the most important figures of Byzantine culture, a historical personality of the greatest magnitude and not just a desiccated commentator of ancient texts.⁶ On the other hand, he saw him as an important exponent of the elitist *Kunstsprache* against which the *Vulgärsprache* was forced to react.⁷ Obviously, Krumbacher had formed his opinion of Eustathios on what had been published at the time he wrote the *GBL*.⁸ Today, we are

1 K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1897), 590–93 (§250) [abbreviated hereafter as *GBL*¹]; this section did not exist in the first edition of 1891 [abbreviated hereafter as *GBL*¹].

2 See his remarks in *GBL*¹ 385–87 (= *GBL*² 787–89).

3 See *GBL*¹ 9–11 (= *GBL*² 16–18) on the twelfth century; see also K. Krumbacher, *Griechische Reise: Blätter aus dem Tagebuche einer Reise in Griechenland und in der Türkei* (Berlin, 1886), xxiv–xxxvi, where he explicitly equated the Modern Greek “Language Question” with what he perceived as Byzantine diglossia. For a broader assessment of these issues see P. A. Agapitos, “Karl Krumbacher and the History of Byzantine Literature,” *BZ* 108 (2012), 1–52.

4 For Anna's phrase see *Alexiad* 2.4.9, ed. D. R. Reinsch and A. Kambylis, *Annae Comnenae Alexias* (Berlin, 2001), 65.99–9.

5 See, however, the pathbreaking study of E. Trapp, “Learned and Vernacular Literature in Byzantium: Dichotomy or Symbiosis?” *DOP* 47 (1993): 114–29, with many examples on the use of vernacular words in a learned environment.

6 See his splendid assessment of Eustathios in the programmatic preface to the first issue of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*; K. Krumbacher, “Vorwort,” *BZ* 1 (1892): 1–12, esp. 4; see also *GBL*² 537 for a shorter version of this assessment.

7 *GBL*¹ 10 (= *GBL*² 17).

8 The main publications were Johann Gottfried Stallbaum's reprint of the sixteenth-century *editio princeps* of the *Parekbolai* to Homer (see below n. 20) and Gottlieb Lucas Friedrich Tafel's edition of various orations and sermons from the Basileensis A-III-20 and the surviving letters from the Par. gr. 1172 (see next note), and Vassilij Regel's

in a far better position to study Eustathios's varied and substantial oeuvre.

Eustathios ὁ τοῦ Καταφλώρον (ca. 1115/20–ca. 1195/98) started his career as a teacher, became a deacon, was appointed μαῖστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων (“professor of orators”) by Patriarch Michael III around 1163/64 and, finally, received from Emperor Manuel I Komnenos the archbishopric of Thessalonike sometime between 1175 and 1178.⁹ Eustathios has been generally viewed as elitist in matters of style and the cultivation of the “noble Attic language” (ἡ εὐγενὴς Ἀττικὴ γλῶσσα), while he has also been seen as looking down upon schedography and rejecting altogether the “humble language” (ἡ ταπεινὴ γλῶσσα).¹⁰ It is these two latter points—schedography and everyday language—that shall be examined in the present paper. My aim is to show that a better knowledge of twelfth-century schedographic production and a proper understanding of the fluidity of what we—against Byzantine

practice—call today “vernacular language,” will help us to evaluate differently Eustathios's apparent rejection of both schedography and colloquial discourse.



The practice of schedography (σχεδογραφία, σχεδουργία, τὰ σχεδικά) is attested since the first decades of the eleventh century. The reading and writing of this new type of grammatical exercise (σχέδος, “sketch, improvisation”) quickly developed into an important element of the education system. A high number of *schede* (sg. schedos) from the late eleventh to the late twelfth century survive in collections transmitted in approximately twenty manuscripts of the thirteenth and early fourteenth century.¹¹ A schedos was written for advanced pupils¹² and served two main aims: it drilled them in the complexities of Greek grammar and syntax, while it also helped them

edition of five orations from the Scor. Y-II-10. Despite Krumbacher's references to this manuscript (GBL² 475 or 541), he did not study it in situ for the *GBL*, because he visited El Escorial only once, in 1902, in order to study the recently discovered Scor. Ψ-IV-22, one of the most important collections of vernacular texts (*Digenis, Livistros, Poulologos, Porikologos, Psarologos*); see K. Krumbacher, “Das mitteligriechische Fischbuch,” *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und der historischen Classe der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1903, 3 (Munich, 1903), 345–80, esp. 345–47.

9 The data of Eustathios's life and career have been a matter of substantial debate. One might mention the following studies: S. Kyriakidis and V. Rotolo, *Eustazio di Tessalonica: La espugnazione di Tessalonica* (Palermo, 1961), xxxiv–lxiii (with the older bibliography); P. Wirth, *Eustathiana: Gesammelte Aufsätze zu Leben und Werk des Metropolitani Eustathios von Thessalonike* (Amsterdam, 1980); A. Kazhdan and S. Franklin, *Studies on Byzantine Literature of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1984), 115–95 (“Eustathios of Thessalonica: The Life and Opinions of a Twelfth-Century Byzantine Rhetor”), esp. 115–40; S. Schönauer, *Eustathios von Thessalonike: Reden auf die große Quadregesima* (Frankfurt a.M., 2006), 3*–6*; K. Metzler, *Eustathii Thessalonicensis De emendanda vita monachica* (Berlin, 2006), 3*–5* and eadem, *Eustathios von Thessalonike und das Mönchtum: Untersuchungen und Kommentar zur Schrift De emendanda vita monachica* (Berlin, 2006), 3–14; F. Kolovou, *Die Briefe des Eustathios von Thessalonike* (Munich, 2006), 3*–5*. For a brief but lucid and informed presentation of Eustathios as an intellectual see R. Browning, “Eustathios of Thessalonike Revisited,” *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 40 (1995): 83–90; for an appreciation of Eustathios as a bishop see M. Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni* (Cambridge, 1995), 179–96.

10 On the former phrase see T. L. F. Tafel, *Eustathii metropolitae Thessalonicensis Opuscula* (Frankfurt a.M., 1832), 40.90, on the latter *Comm.* 413.8 (for the relevant edition see below n. 20).

11 A historical-literary study of schedography, together with an edition of the twelfth-century collections, is a major desideratum of Byzantine philology. For the purposes of the present study note should be made of the pioneering work of S. D. Papadimitriou, *Feodor Prodrom: Istoriko-literaturnoe izslédovanie* (Odessa, 1905), 413–29. For more recent discussions of various issues, presentations of manuscripts and editions of various texts see, indicatively, C. Gallavotti, “Nota sulla schedografia di Moscopulo e suoi precedenti fino a Teodoro Prodromo,” *Bollettino dei Classici*, 3rd ser.s, 4 (1983): 3–35, esp. 12–35; I. Vassis, “Graeca sunt, non leguntur: Zu den schedographischen Spielereien des Theodoros Prodromos,” *BZ* 86–87 (1993–94): 1–19; idem, “Τῶν νέων φιλολόγων παλαιοῦσιν: Ἡ συλλογὴ σχεδῶν τοῦ κώδικα Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 92,” *Ελληνικά* 52 (2002): 37–68; I. D. Polemis, “Προβλήματα τῆς βυζαντινῆς σχεδογραφίας,” *Ελληνικά* 45 (1995): 277–302; idem, “Philologische und historische Probleme in der schedographischen Sammlung des Codex Marcianus gr. XI,34,” *Byzantion* 67 (1997): 252–63. For a useful overview see S. Efthymiadis, “L'enseignement secondaire à Constantinople pendant les XI^e et XII^e siècles: Modèle éducatif pour la Terre d'Otrante au XIII^e siècle,” *Νέα Πώμη* 2 (2005): 259–75, esp. 266–75 (with substantial bibliography), but also F. G. Giannachi, “Per la storia dell'istruzione bizantina in Terra d'Otranto: La schedografia di Stefano di Nardò,” *Medioevo Greco* 13 (2013): 103–25. For two broader, but differently focused, surveys of Byzantine education see A. Markopoulos, “De la structure de l'école byzantine: Le maître, les livres et le processus éducatif,” in *Lire et écrire à Byzance*, ed. B. Mondrain (Paris, 2006), 85–96 and A. Giannouli, “Education and Literary Language in Byzantium,” in *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature*, ed. M. Hinterberger (Turnhout, 2014), 52–71. For an interpretive approach to schedography and generic experimentation in the Komnenian era see P. A. Agapitos, “Grammar, Genre and Patronage in the Twelfth Century: A Scientific Paradigm and its Implications,” *JÖB* 64 (2014): 1–22.

12 See briefly Vassis, “Παλαιόματα,” 41–42 on the three levels of language training at school, and the place of schedography in the second level.

to understand the *progymnasmata*, that is, the different types of models of rhetorical composition.¹³ These two aims were achieved through the puzzling form in which the “grammarian” (γραμματικός) presented the schedos. The text, punctuated in an erratic manner, was filled with strange words and phrases giving no meaning. The pupils had to decode this “riddle” and to rewrite it correctly.¹⁴ The puzzles were based on similarities of sound, called ἀντίστοιχα (“correspondences”).¹⁵ For example, we will find phrases playing with similarly sounding nominal and verbal forms¹⁶ or wrongly written phrases that need to be acoustically decoded.¹⁷ Most schedes were in prose (usually up to twenty lines in length), but there survives a fair number of schedes in iambic twelve-syllable verse. By the middle of the twelfth century a particular type of schedos had become fashionable, in which an antistoichic prose section is concluded by a short non-antistoichic poem, often addressed to a recipient.¹⁸

Eustathios included a substantial number of various comments on schedography in his works.¹⁹ They figure most prominently in his *Parekbolai* on the Homeric poems, written mostly in the 1160s and

1170s.²⁰ In the *Parekbolai* Eustathios does not make any generalizing negative comments when referring to schedography. As we now know, he even composed schedes himself.²¹ He employs a number of words to describe the schedos, such as “puzzle” (γρίφος), “riddle” (ἀίνιγμα or νόημα) and “labyrinth” (λαβύρινθος), while he also describes the lexical complexity of the schedos as “labyrinthine” (λαβυρινθώδης).²² Most comments of Eustathios referring to schedography in the *Parekbolai* take as their starting point a Homeric phrase which could be read as an antistoichic sound play. Three such comments should suffice to give an impression of how Eustathios viewed such grammatical traps:

(i) Labyrinthine schedography

Τοῦ δὲ ἱχνευταὶ περίφρασις ὃν τὸ «ἴχνη ἔρευνῶντες» κάλλιον ἐκείνου πέφρασται. Ὅρα δ' ἐνταῦθα τὸ «ἴχνη ἔρευνῶντες» ὑποδύσκολον ὃν τῇ φράσει καὶ λαβυρινθώδης κατὰ τὰ νῦν σχεδικά· ἦν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἴχνη γράψαι διὰ τοῦ η, εἴλετο δὲ ἡ ποιήσις τὸ ἴχνηα.²³

13 Many of the surviving schedes display forms that reflect the various types of *progymnasmata*, such as fables, narratives, mottoes, character monologues and the like; see the respective groupings as presented by Vassis, *ibid.*, 42.

14 This is what Anna describes, when she remarks that in the school of the *Orphanotropheion* one could see “some boys being writers of the so-called improvised sketches” (*Alexias* 15.7.9, ed. Reinsch and Kambylis 484.14: οἱ δὲ [sc. παῖδες] ξυγγραφεῖς τῶν λεγομένων σχεδῶν).

15 For the problems concerning antistoichic vowel errors in scribal practice and the resulting need for orthographic training see E. Follieri, “Ἀντίστοιχα,” *Diptycha* 4 (1986–87): 217–28.

16 From an unedited schedos of Stylianos in the Vat. Pal. gr. 92, f. 194v: εἰ δείσεις, θεόν, ὦ παῖ, καὶ περὶ λόγων εἰδήσεις ἰδίσεις, ἡγήσεις σαυτὸν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν δήσεις (Gallavotti, “Nota” [n. 11 above], 27 n. 23).

17 From a schedos of Constantine Manasses transmitted in Vat. Pal. gr. 92, f. 235r: (a) καὶ ἐκίσσησεν ἰω τε instead of καὶ αἰκίσσεις ἐνίστε, and (b) ἐνώκεε τε ῥωσθεις instead of ἐνῶ καὶ ἕτερός τις (I. D. Polemis, “Fünfundierte Texte des Konstantinos Manasses,” *RSBN* 33 [1996]: 279–92, esp. 283).

18 See, for example, the schedes of George, headmaster of the school of the Holy Forty Martyrs (I. D. Polemis, “Γεώργιος μαῖστωρ ἀγιοτεσσαρακοντῆς,” *Ἑλληνικά* 46 [1996]: 301–6), or, above all, Theodore Prodromos (see the list in Vassis, “Graeca sunt,” 3–5).

19 For a brief discussion of schedography in Eustathios, as part of school training in Byzantium, see P. I. Koukoules, *Θεσσαλονίκη Εὐσταθίου τὰ λαογραφικά* (Athens, 1950), 1:464–67 with a broad but uncritical collection of passages.

20 For the date and composition of the *Parekbolai* see now E. Cullhed, *Eustathios of Thessalonike: Parekbolai on Homer's Odyssey 1–2; Proekdosis* (Uppsala, 2014), 4*–9*. The text of the Iliadic part is quoted from M. van der Valk, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editi*, 4 vols. (Leiden, 1971–87), along with H. M. Keizer, *Indices in Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarios ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, ad fidem codicis Laurentiani editos a Marchino van der Valk* (Leiden, 1995); the text of the Odyssean part is quoted from J. G. Stallbaum, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam ad fidem exempli Romani editi*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1825–26).

21 Gallavotti, “Nota,” 33 mentions an unpublished schedos in Vat. gr. 2299 (early fourteenth cent.) bearing the lemma τοῦ ἀγνωτάτου Θεσσαλονίκης κυροῦ Εὐσταθίου. One might also refer to Eustathios's *Consideration on the “Kyrie eleison” in two improvised questions on account of someone contentious more than necessary* (Εἰς τὸ «Κύριε ἐλέησον» σκέψις ἐν δυσὶ πεύσει σχεδίοις διὰ τινα παρὰ τὸ δέον ἐριστικόν), edited by P. Wirth, *Eustathii Thessalonicensis opera minora* (Berlin, 2000), 61–77; the edition should be used together with the extensive review of I. D. Polemis, “Κριτικὴ καὶ ἐρμηνευτικὴ παρατηρήσεις σὲ κείμενα τοῦ Εὐσταθίου Θεσσαλονίκης,” *Βυζαντινά* 21 (2000): 85–121.

22 See the relevant terminology in the passages quoted in the following pages.

23 *CommOd.* 1871.63–72.1 to *Od.* 19.436 (ἴχνη ἔρευνῶντες κύνες ἦϊσαν, αὐτὰρ ὀπισθεν). For a similar comment on *Iliad* 18.321 (μετ' ἀνέρος ἴχνη ἔρευνῶν) see *CommIl.* 1141.26–28, where the antistoichic

The phrase “searching the trails” being a circumlocution of “hunters,” is more beautifully expressed than the simple noun. Note that here ἔχνη ἐρευνῶντες is difficult as to its phrasing and labyrinthine in the style of recent schedography; for one could also write ἔχνη with an eta (η), but the poem chose ἔχνηα.

(ii) Schedographic deceit

“Ορα δ’ ἐν τοῖς ῥηθεῖσι καὶ ὅτι τὸ «αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ ῥ’ Ἴσον τε καὶ Ἀντιφον ἐξεναρίζων» σχεδικοῦς τερθρεῖας καὶ τοῦ κατὰ αὐτὴν λαβυρίνθου κεῖται λεληθότως ἀφορμὴ τοῖς ὕστερον, ὅποια καὶ ἄλλα παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ, τεθέντα μὲν ἀπραγματεύτως κατὰ συνθήκην συνήθη, παρελκυσθέντα δὲ τοῖς γραμματικοῖς εἰς μίμησιν. Προβέβληται μὲν γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἐν τῷ «βῆ ῥ’ Ἴσον» Ῥήσου δῆθεν τινὸς ἀπήχησις, ὅποῖος ὁ προϊστορηθεὶς Θραξ ἥρως.²⁴

Note also in what has been said that the verse αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ ῥ’ Ἴσον τε καὶ Ἀντιφον ἐξεναρίζων (“he then went on to kill Isus and Antiphon”) is secretly laid there for later readers as a starting point for schedographic deceit²⁵ and its labyrinth, just as other devices are found in the poet, artlessly placed there in accordance to conventional composition, but appropriated by the grammarians for the purpose of imitation. For here in «βῆ ῥ’ Ἴσον» the sound is reproduced [of the name] of a certain Rhesus, such as the aforementioned Thracian hero.

(iii) Deceitful riddles

παρακείμενον δὲ τὸ «νωθῆς» μετὰ τὸ «παῖδας», «ἐβήσατο» γάρ, φησί, «παῖδας νωθῆς», φιλοῖτο

soundplay is catching “first-level pupils” (τοὺς εἰσαγωγικούς) like a “net” (ἀμφιβλήστρου δίκην); see van der Valk, 4:184 *ad locum*.

24 *CommIl.* 833.62–66 to *Il.* 11.101. In *CommOd.* 1634.18–20 Eustathios refers back to this discussion of *Iliad* 11.101 and the supposed misplacement of the Thracian Rhesus in the Homeric poem (see Papadimitriou, *Feodor Prodrom* [n. 11 above], 420).

25 The noun *τερθρεία*, first attested in Isocrates (*orat.* 10.4) in the sense “extreme subtlety” with a negative coloring, is used in Byzantine texts also in the sense of “deceit,” e.g., *Suda* τ 344, in *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, 5 vols. (Leipzig, 1928–1938), 4:526.29–30 (σημαίνει καὶ ἀπάτη, καὶ περιεργία).

ἄν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκδιδόντων ἄρτι τοὺς σχεδικοὺς γρίφους ὡς ἀπατήλιον τοῖς παισὶ.²⁶

And νωθῆς being placed after παῖδας (for the poet says ἐβήσατο παῖδας νωθῆς), it would be much loved by those who now publish the schedographic riddles being deceitful for the pupils.

A common feature of the three passages is that the sound play can function only if the Homeric text is read with the medieval pronunciation of Greek (νωθῆς = νωθεῖς, ῥ’ Ἴσον = Ῥῆσον). In the first passage Eustathios points himself to the acoustic similarity of the elided ἔχνη (= ἔχνηα) to the more conventional form ἔχνη. From these and other passages it becomes obvious that Eustathios as a teacher of rhetoric was very much interested in this type of sound ambiguity;²⁷ he sometimes even suggested when, for reasons of good taste, they should be avoided.²⁸ In Book 9 of the *Parekbolai* to the *Odyssey*, Eustathios makes a long digression on the schedo.²⁹ Pointing to a

26 *CommIl.* 862.47–49 to *Il.* 11.558–59 (ὡς δ’ ὅτ’ ὄνος παρ’ ἄρουραν ἰὼν ἐβήσατο παῖδας | νωθῆς, ᾧ δὲ πολλὰ περὶ ῥόπαλ’ ἀμφὶς ἐάγη). The point here, of course, is that the young pupils would hear νωθεῖς and be misled in thinking that the adjective in the accusative plural defines παῖδας, rather than the nominative singular νωθῆς defining ὄνος of the previous verse.

27 See also his remark in *CommIl.* 1341.58–60: “Ορα δὲ ὅτι τοῖς παίζειν τὰ σχεδικά ἐθέλουσιν ἀφορμὴν δίδωσι τὸ «αἶ κέν πως ἐμέ τε δείσῃ ἀπὸ θ’ Ἐκτορα λύσῃ» [*Il.* 2.4.116] καὶ δειλίαν δηλοῦντος καὶ δεσμὸν κατὰ γε μόνην τὴν προφορὰν (i.e., δείσῃ and δήσῃ). It is exactly the soundplay expounded by the teacher Stylianos in his short schedo on the grammatical variations of δειδω (“fear”) and δέω (“bind”), printed in part above at n. 16. Eustathios even composed a brief essay, unfortunately now lost, on a complex soundplay in a liturgical hymn; the heading of the essay, once included in the *Scor.* A-II-11 (thirteenth century?), which perished in the 1671 fire at El Escorial, reads: περὶ τῆς ἀνεπισημάντου διπλόης ἐν τῇ προφορᾷ τοῦ Μυστήριον ξένον ὁρώ καὶ παράδοξον (“On the undetected ambiguity in the pronunciation of [the hymn] *A mystery strange and wondrous do I behold*”); Schönauer, *Eustathios* [n. 9 above], 18* (text no. 42).

28 See his remark on antistoichic technique in the last digression he makes on schedography in the *Parekbolai*. Having commented on *Od.* 22.157 (ἤλθες δὲ Εὐμαίε), he writes at *CommOd.* 1809.7–8: καὶ ἄλλα δὲ τοιαῦτα μυρία Ὀμηρικά τε καὶ ἄλλως ποιητικά, οὔτε ζήλωτὰ εἰς τὸ καταλογάδην γράφειν καὶ οὐδὲ οἷα λόγου νῦν ἡξιώσθαι πλείονος (“and there exist myriads of similar such Homeric and otherwise poetic phrases, which are neither to be emulated in prose writing, nor worthy of any further discussion at this point”).

29 *CommOd.* 1634.6–32; see the brief discussion by Papadimitriou, *Feodor Prodrom*, 420–21.

series of words difficult to distinguish acoustically in the Homeric poems, he notes the following:³⁰

Παλαιὸς μὲν τις ἐπίγραμμα τωθαστικὸν εἰς
τινα ἱατρὸν Ἀκρωνα ἔγραψεν οὕτως. «Ἀκρων
ἱατρὸν ἄκρον Ἀκραγαντίνων», ἐπίτηδες οὕτω
γράφας ἐκεῖνος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος. Οἱ
δὲ νεώτεροι ταῦτα καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα ζηλώσαντες,
πολλὰ δ' ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς εὔρηται ὅμοια ὡς
πολλαχοῦ δεδήλωται, γρίφους ἐμελέτησαν πλέκειν
οὓς ὠνόμασαν σχέδη, τὴν ἀρχὴν μὲν λεπτοῦς τινὰς
καὶ οἴους ῥῆον ἐκδιαδράσκεσθαι, τέλος δὲ ἄδρους
καὶ δυσδιαφύκτους. Καὶ οἱ μὲν παλαιοὶ τὸ ῥηθὲν τοῦ
Ἐπιχάρμου νόημα, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος
καὶ ὅσα δὲ ἀρχαῖα τοιαῦτα, θαυμάσιως ἐκάλουν
ὡς ἐνομοθέτησεν ὁ Ἐπίχαρμος, «λόγον ἐν λόγῳ»
αὐτὰ εἰπὼν, διὰ τὸ «ὡς ἐν αἰνίγματι ἄλλον μὲν εἶναι
τὸν λαλούμενον λόγον, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν νοούμενον». Οἱ δὲ τὰ
σχεδὶκὰ λαλοῦντες ἀκολούθως καὶ αὐτοὶ
νοήματα καλοῦσιν ἅπερ γριφεύονται, διὰ τὸ καὶ
τὸν γραμματέα παῖδα μὴ τοῦ λεγομένου ἀλλὰ τοῦ
νοούμενου γίνεσθαι.

Some person of old wrote a derogatory epigram on a doctor called Akron: “Akron the doctor, the Acropolis of Akragas,” purposefully writing in this manner and not by coincidence. But the moderns, wishing to emulate these and similar practices (for there are many such tricks found in ancient writings as it has been often stated), made a studious effort to weave puzzles which they named “sketches,” initially somehow delicate and of a style that could be easily fled from, but finally powerful and hard to escape. And the old ones admirably called the already mentioned “riddle” of Epicharmus³¹ and that of the epigram and all similar ancient ones as Epicharmus himself had stipulated, having declared them “a discourse within a discourse,” because “as if in a riddle the spoken word is one thing and the subsumed word a different thing.” Thus, the people declaiming the *schede* have subsequently called “riddles” what they puzzlingly compose, because

the boy learning grammar has to grasp not what is spoken but what is assumed.

Eustathios quotes the beginning of a derogatory epigram attributed since ancient times to Empedocles.³² He compares the epigram’s antistoichic play of sound and word with “the moderns” (οἱ νεώτεροι) who “wishing to emulate these and similar practices . . . made a studious effort to weave puzzles that they named *schede*.” Such a type of sound play, he points out, was applied “purposefully” (ἐπίτηδες) by the author of the epigram. Furthermore, Eustathios remarks that these puzzles were “initially somehow delicate and of a style that could be easily fled from, but finally they were powerful and hard to escape.”³³ He notes that the ancients called such riddles “a discourse within a discourse,” following a *bon mot* of Epicharmus.³⁴ Eustathios rounds off his remarks by suggesting that the contemporary grammarians follow ancient practice in calling their puzzle-like exercises “riddles” (νοήματα).

There are two important points that need to be stressed here. First, the opposition τὴν ἀρχὴν μὲν . . . τέλος δὲ established by Eustathios suggests a chronological differentiation between the first phases of *schedography*, when the *schede* were rather simple exercises, and its present phase, that is, around 1150–70, when the *schede* had become extremely complex and obscure texts. Second, Eustathios viewed the complexity of

32 The epigram runs as follows: Ἀκρον ἱατρὸν Ἀκρων Ἀκραγαντίνων πατὴρ Ἀκρου | κρύπτει κρημνὸς ἄκρος πατρίδος ἀκροτάτης (Diels-Kranz 31 B 157, from Diog. Laert. 8.65). Eustathios knew the epigram from the *Suda* (α 1026; ed. Adler, 1:94.18–26), since it is only there that the couplet is characterized as τωθαστικὸν ἐπίγραμμα.

33 The rare word *dysdiaphuktos* (see *LBG* 1:417) was used in a similar meaning, but related to philosophical syllogisms, by Eustathios’s patron Michael ὁ τοῦ Ἀγχιάλου in 1165 or 1167 (on him see below n. 51); see R. Browning, “A New Source on Byzantine-Hungarian Relations in the Twelfth Century: The Inaugural Lecture of Michael ὁ τοῦ Ἀγχιάλου as ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων,” *Balkan Studies* 2 (1961): 173–214 (repr. in idem, *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature and Education* [London, 1977], no. IV), esp. 189.87–88 (τοῦ διεξοδεύειν ἀκινδύνως τοῦ λαβυρίνθου τὴν δυσδιάφυκτον ἑλίκαν).

34 No such passage could be detected in the surviving fragments of the comic poet. One might see, however, Plutarch’s *De sera numinis vindicta* §15 (*Moralia* 559A, in *Plutarchi Moralia*, vol. 3, ed. W. R. Paton and M. Pohlenz and W. Sieveking [Leipzig, 1929], 422.6–10) on the disjunction between what is said and what is meant in sophistic discourse as perceived by the followers of Epicharmus.

30 *CommOd.* 1634.11–18 to *Od.* 9.366; the passage quoted here is only the middle section of this long comment on deceitful soundplays.

31 This is a deceitful phrase attributed to Epicharmus and quoted by Eustathios in the first part of this digression.

the schedos as an emulation of a past practice.³⁵ This “emulation” seems to legitimize in his eyes the modern invention of schedography. Eustathios’s attitude is one found quite often in Byzantine culture; it covers a broad area of innovative activities from government administration to artistic experimentation, where novelty is veiled as imitation of ancient practices.³⁶

In all passages quoted so far Eustathios does not characterize schedography with negative attributes. There are only three passages in the *Parekbolai*—all of them are to be found in the Iliadic part—where he makes a negative remark as to the correct understanding of Greek in relation to schedography. In the first case, concerning *Iliad* 2.373 (τῷ κε τάχ’ ἡμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος), Eustathios writes:³⁷

Τὸ δὲ «τάχ’ ἡμύσειε» παλαιὸν μὲν ἄνδρα οὐκ ἂν παρήγαγεν ὥς ἐθάδα τῶν τοιούτων· τοῦ δὲ νῦν γένους τινὲς πλανηθεῖεν ἂν δοκοῦντες ἀκούειν «τάχει», εἴτα κατ’ ἰδίαν «μύσειε», νόμῳ δηλαδὴ σχεδικοῦ.

The phrase τάχ’ ἡμύσειε (“will swiftly fall”) would not have misled a man of old times accustomed to such devices. But some persons of the present generation would be deceived thinking that they hear τάχει, then separately, μύσειε (“shall close with speed”), that is, according to schedographic custom.

35 See also his remark on *Od.* 22.157 at *CommOd.* 1809.12 (ἐξ ὧν [sc. sound plays] ἡ τῶν σχεδοποιῶν εἰληφθαι δοκεῖ μέθοδος), where he suggests that the schedographic “method” appears to have been lifted from such antistoichic passages in Homer. Eustathios considered that the *Odyssey* offered more “starting points” (ἀφορμαί) for rhetorical richness than the more austere *Iliad*; see *CommIl.* 4.45–5.2 along with the discussion on *aphormai* in van der Valk, 1:xcii–c (§99), as well as the passage quoted above in n. 27; more broadly see now R. Nünlist, “Homer as a Blueprint for Speechwriters: Eustathius’ Commentaries and Rhetoric,” *GRBS* 52 (2012): 493–509.

36 See P. Odorico, “La politica dell’imagination di Leone VI il Saggio,” *Byzantion* 53 (1983): 597–631, esp. 613–17; P. A. Agapitos, “Teachers, Pupils and Imperial Power in Eleventh-Century Byzantium,” in *Pedagogy and Power: Rhetorics of Classical Learning*, ed. N. Livingstone and Y. L. Too (Cambridge, 1998), 170–91, esp. 189–91; M. D. Lauxtermann, “The Velocity of Pure Iambs: Byzantine Observations on the Metre and Rhythm of the Dodecasyllable,” *JÖB* 48 (1998): 9–33, esp. 19–25.

37 *CommIl.* 2.41.33–36 to *Il.* 2.343ff.

Eustathios suggests that some of his contemporaries would divide the phrase wrongly, following the schedographic practice of antistoichic sound plays based, as we saw, on the medieval pronunciation of ancient Greek. Thus, the education of these people appears wanting because it has been shaped by schedography.³⁸ Of course, Eustathios’s remark also reveals that for him the “man of old accustomed to such devices” similarly declaimed the Homeric poem with Medieval Greek pronunciation—an indication that Eustathios did not have the same kind of historical understanding as modern philology does.³⁹

The comments of Eustathios about schedography in his own times suggest that something more than grammar was involved in the writing of schedae around the middle of the twelfth century. This “something more” the professor of rhetoric described more fully in a letter to the young Nikephoros Komnenos (ca. 1144–ca. 1173), grandson of Nikephoros Bryennios and Anna Komnene.⁴⁰ The letter is a lengthy and learned exegesis, wherein Eustathios expounded the etymology and history of the *calendae*.⁴¹ Having explained the difference between the three “marked” days of a Roman month (καλάνδαι, νόνναι, εἰδοί), Eustathios comments:⁴²

38 See *CommIl.* 884.8–10: Τὸ δὲ «κελεύων ὑμῶν ἄμμιν ἐπεσθαι» [*Il.* 11.781 ὑμῶν ἄμ’ ἐπεσθαι] σκληρόν ἐστι καὶ τῇ φράσει καὶ τῇ συναλιφῇ. Ὁ γοῦν τὰ σχεδικά γριφεύων «μάμμη» ἂν παρακούσοι ἐνταῦθα οἱ τῶν τοιούτων ἐθᾶς (with van der Valk, 3:327 *ad locum* on Eustathios having written the verse unmetrically from memory and thus creating a nonexistent soundplay). In this comment it is the schedographer who is “accustomed to such devices” and might fall into the trap.

39 See, for example, the cautionary remarks of A. Könken, *BZ* 86–87 (1993–94): 109–11 concerning the conclusions of A. Kambylis, *Eustathios über Pindars Epinikiendichtung: Ein Kapitel klassischer Philologie in Byzanz* (Göttingen, 1991).

40 See K. Barzos, *Ἡ γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν* (Thessaloniki, 1984), 2:87–95 (no. 115). Eustathios obviously entertained a personal relationship with Nikephoros, as can be seen from the twenty-one letters he addressed to him, as well as from a monody he composed upon the young man’s death; see E. Kurtz, “Evstathija Thessalonikijskogo i Konstantina Manassi monodii na končinu Nikifora Komnina,” *VizVrem* 17 (1910): 282–322, esp. 290–302, and A. Sideras, *Die byzantinischen Grabreden: Prosopographie, Datierung, Überlieferung; 142 Epitaphien und Monodien aus dem byzantinischen Jahrtausend* (Vienna, 1994), 182–84.

41 *Ep.* 7, ed. Kolovou, *Die Briefe* (n. 9 above), 26–36; see also the summary with notes in *ibid.*, 97*–101*. On this letter as a source for the custom of carol singing on 1 January (καλάνδα) see Koukoules, *Εὐσταθίου λαογραφικά* (n. 19 above), 2:7–9.

42 *Ep.* 7.189–200, ed. Kolovou, 34.

Νῦν δ' ἀλλὰ τὰ τῆς κοινῆς ἐκείνης συνθήκης παρεσπονδήθη· καὶ ἡ τῶν σχεδικῶν νοημάτων τύραννος ἀνάγκη τὴν παλαιὰν χρῆσιν βιασαμένη παρανομεῖ, εἰδοὺς τε καὶ νόνας καὶ τὰς ἀπλῶς ἡμέρας ἄγουσα εἰς ταῦτόν. Καὶ ἔπαθον ταῦτόν οἱ γραμματικοὶ ἄρτι, ὃ καὶ οἱ πεσόντες ὑπὸ πολιορκίαν πολυετή. Ἐκεῖνοι τε γὰρ ἐν στενῷ κομιδῇ καθειργμένοι, ἔστιν οὐ πιεσθέντες ἐνδεία, οὐδὲ τῶν ἀψαύστων ἀνειμένη γλώσση σωματῶν ἀπέσχοντο, λιμοῦ κἀνταῦθα δαιταλουργούντος αὐτοῖς· καὶ αὐτοὶ τῷ λαβυρίνθῳ τῶν σχεδικῶν ἐλιγμῶν ἐναπειλημμένοι, καὶ λέξεων εὐπόρως οὐκ ἔχοντες, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰπεῖν λιμώττοντες, αἷς περιεργότερον χρῆσονται, καὶ τῶν τοιούτων κατεξάνεστησαν καὶ χορεύσαντες οἷον ἀδιαφόρως αὐτὰς συνείλον εἰς ἓν.

But now indeed the agreements of that common treaty have been broken; by violating ancient practice, the tyrannical necessity of schedographic riddles has acted unlawfully, leading the Ides and the Nonae and the normal days into the same meaning. Thus, the grammarians have recently suffered the same thing to people who have fallen under a year-long siege. For the latter, entirely imprisoned in dire straits, were sometimes pressed by want of sustenance and did not desist from eating even untouchable bodies with their unrestrained tongues,⁴³ since hunger in this case too prepared a banquet for them. Similarly, the former [i.e., the grammarians] were oppressed by the labyrinth of schedographic windings⁴⁴ and did not have a wealth of words at hand but were starving, so to speak, which words to use in a more curious manner; thus, they rose up against such words and, as if dancing [in a frenzy], they indiscriminately united them all into one.

Here Eustathios openly criticizes the tyranny of schedography that has “recently” (ἄρτι) forced the grammarians to mix into one the different meanings and usages of the old Roman words. He then employs a vivid simile to give

a reason for the “breaking of that common treaty,” comparing the grammarians to the inhabitants of a city that has been besieged for many years. Forced by hunger, who prepared for them a banquet, the people did not desist from eating even polluted animals and humans with their unrestrained mouths. This allusive passage clearly echoes Flavius Josephus’s famous description of cannibalism during the siege of Jerusalem in AD 70 by Titus (*Bellum Iudaicum* 6.193–213), a passage well known in Byzantine historiography.⁴⁵ Similarly to the besieged, Eustathios scathingly comments, the grammarians rose against the old Roman words and “indiscriminately united them all into one.”

The complex sentence offers to the recipient a negative image of violent Bacchic *sparagmos* as the use here of “dancing” (χορεύσαντες) insinuates.⁴⁶ In my opinion, this reflects a critique toward a peculiar case of

45 For example, Eusebios of Caesarea quoted it verbatim in his *Ecclesiastical History* 3.6.17–28 (Eusebius, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. E. Schwartz and T. Mommsen, 3 vols. [Berlin, 1902–9], 1:206–10), George the Monk in the ninth century included an abbreviated version of it in his *Chronicle* (*Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, 2 vols. [Leipzig, 1904], 2:385.10–386.16), as did other chroniclers. Moreover, the horrid story forms the hypotext of a poem contemporary to Eustathios, written by the high judge Andronikos, on a case of cannibalism in southwestern Asia Minor; see R. Macrides, “Poetic Justice in the Patriarchate—Murder and Cannibalism in the Provinces,” in *Cupido legum*, ed. L. Burgmann and M. T. Fögen and A. Schminck (Frankfurt a.M., 1985), 137–68, esp. 150–51 on the sources of the poem. One might also compare the similar description of the siege of Larissa in late 985 by the Bulgarian Tsar Samuel as narrated by the general Kekaumenos in his memoirs (§73, ed. Litavrin, 250–52).

46 That this is the image behind Eustathios’s extremely dense phrasing can be seen from its explicit use by Michael ὁ τοῦ Ἀγχιάλου in his address to Manuel (see above n. 33). God, says Michael, holds him as a philosopher back from following inappropriate paths, as if in a Bacchic frenzy: ἐπέχων [sc. the Creator] ἐνθα μὲ μὴ δέῃ παροιστρούμενον, ἐπισυνάγων καὶ συγκρατῶν ἀλλοκότοις μὲ ῥύμαις ἐκβακχευόμενον (Browning, “New Source,” 193.212–14). The verb χορεύω is used mostly by classicizing Byzantine authors to invoke the domain of the theatre (see, for example, Phot. *Ep.* 234 in *Photii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerink, 7 vols. [Leipzig, 1982–88], 2:151.36–41) and concomitantly the state of Dionysiac frenzy; see P. Agapitos, “Narrative, Rhetoric, and ‘Drama’ Rediscovered: Scholars and Poets in Byzantium Interpret Heliodorus,” in *Studies in Heliodorus*, ed. R. Hunter (Cambridge, 1998), 125–56, esp. 128–42 for further examples. Eustathios himself hints at such an imagery in the *protheoria* to his *Capture of Thessalonike* (*praef.* §1; ed. Kyriakidis [n. 9], 2.24–28), where phrases like ἀκράτως τραγωδεῖν (“lamenting in an unblended manner, i.e., excessively), χορεύων ἐν πένθεισιν (“dancing in mourning”) and ἐν σκυθρωποῖς πάθεισιν (“in grim sufferings”) accentuate the notion of “tragic excess” in lamentation.

43 The sentence could also be translated as “and did not desist from eating even bodies untouchable for a tongue at ease (i.e., not in a state of necessity).”

44 I have rendered ἐλιγμός as “winding,” following the explanation in the *Suda* s 847; ed. Adler, 2:247.2 (ἐλιγμός· ἡ συστροφή).

culinary (*qua* literary) transgression. In fact, Eustathios often used the imagery of *opsopoia* (cooking) and *daitalourgia* (banqueting) to express aesthetic issues of poetry and rhetoric.⁴⁷ He even made a positive remark about Homer as a rhetorician by exclaiming “what an astonishing banquet of rhetoric did he prepare” (θαυμασίαν οἶαν δαιταλουργίαν ῥητορείας ἐσκεύασεν).⁴⁸ However, in *Ep.* 7 the personification of hunger prepares an abominable banquet. Therefore, this image of transgression points to the attempt of the grammarians to create out of conventional linguistic exercises some kind of novel literary text. For Eustathios—a man of impeccable literary taste—this was a failed enterprise resulting in ignorance of the appropriate vocabulary and an excess of labyrinthine winding. It proved to be an effort at *haute cuisine* that ended up in producing a horrid assortment of grotesque dishes.⁴⁹ Moreover, Eustathios makes it clear that the transgression of “that common treaty” (*qua* accepted convention) by the grammarians—in other words, abandoning innovation as imitation and moving into the unlawful domain of unveiled novelty—occurred close to the time of the letter’s composition (νῦν δ’ ἄλλᾳ). That Eustathios knew very well to what kind of accepted convention he was referring can be seen from his remarks concerning his own literary experiments, which were always presented as veiled novelties.⁵⁰ But also Nikephoros Komnenos knew very well what Eustathios was talking about when criticizing the recent excesses of the grammarians, since

the young aristocrat had been appointed by Emperor Manuel to act as official examiner in the schedographic contests organized at the palace.⁵¹

Stylistic excess as a sign of bad taste forms the core of another comment of Eustathios on schedography. While still “master of orators,” he delivered, probably on the Saturday of Lazarus in 1174, an extensive encomiastic oration for Patriarch Michael ὁ τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου (78–1170).⁵² The patriarch, who before ascending the ecumenical throne had been ὑπατος τῶν φιλοσόφων (“consul of philosophers”), was Eustathios’s patron. He had appointed the learned deacon to the coveted chair of rhetoric and later to the bishopric of Myra.⁵³ Within an extensive presentation of the patriarch’s earlier educational activities, Eustathios comes to speak about Michael’s schedographic teaching. He writes:⁵⁴

εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν καινὴν ταύτην αἰνιγματικὴν δεήσει πλέξασθαι τὴν ἐν σχεδικοῖς ἐλιγμοῖς, ἀλλ’ οὗτος ἡμῖν ἀναπέφηνε χαρακτήρ ἐπίσημος οὐ τῇ πρὸς σχοῖνον παρατάσει τῶν σχημάτων ἀπόδημον στέλλων τὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ, ἀλλὰ συνηγμένος εἰς μέτριον καὶ τῷ εὐπεριλήπτῳ ψυχαγωγῶν καὶ οὐ τῷ ἀλλοκοτῷ καὶ ἀξυμφανεί τοῦ αἰνίγματος ἐξαγριῶν τοῦ λόγου τὸ πρόσωπον, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς φράσεως ἀνθρῶ καὶ τὸ τοῦ αἰνίγματος σκυθρωπάζον κεραννύων εἰς ἱλαρότητα καὶ τῷ φαινομένῳ συνεκλάμπειν τεχνώμενος τὸ κρυπτόμενον.

and if you [i.e., the patriarch] needed to weave this novel enigmatics which is expressed in

47 See Kolovou, *Die Briefe*, 57*–73*. Obviously, the offer of educational nourishment by a teacher to his student is often expressed through the image of a banquet. In the case of *Ep.* 7, however, the readers are faced with the inverted and negative use of this image.

48 *Comm.* 829.48. Athenaeus in his *Deipnosophists* 8, §39 (= 347e; ed. Kaibel, 2:262.27–263.1) has one participant note that Aeschylus once remarked that his tragedies were “carvings” from Homer’s “grand banquets” (τὸ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ λαμπροῦ Αἰσχύλου, ὅς τὰς αὐτοῦ τραγωδίας τεμάχη ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῶν Ὁμήρου μεγάλων δείπνων). Irrespective of what Aeschylus was supposed to have meant with this *bon mot*, Eustathios is concerned with Homer as provider of rhetorical “starting points” (see above, n. 35).

49 On literary cookery in Byzantium see F. Kolovou, “Die Rezeption der Platonischen *Opsopoia* in der byzantinischen Literatur,” in *Byzantinische Sprachkunst: Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Hinterberger and E. Schiffer (Berlin, 2007), 181–93.

50 See P. A. Agapitos, “Mischung der Gattungen und Überschreitung der Gesetze: Die Grabrede des Eustathios von Thessalonike auf Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites,” *JÖB* 48 (1998): 119–46, esp. 127–31 on the *protheoria* of this funeral oration.

51 This information, along with a brief description of the examination process, is provided by Constantine Manasses in the funeral oration he composed for Nikephoros; see the edition by Kurtz, “Evstathii,” 302–22, esp. 317.453–66. The passage has been translated and commented upon by Polemis, “Fünf unedierte Texte,” 280–81.

52 *OpMin.* 7, ed. Wirth, 100–40. On Michael see *ODB* 2:1364–65 (A. Kazhdan) and Angold, *Church and Society*, 108–11. For the Komnenian “institution” of delivering on the Saturday of Lazarus encomiastic orations in honor of the patriarch—Eustathios refers to it as ὁ τῆς σοφιστείας ταύτης θεσμός and τὸ παλαιὸν θέσμιον (Wirth, 100.5 and 29)—see M. Loukaki, “Le samedi du Lazare et les éloges annuels du patriarche de Constantinople,” in *Κλητόριον εἰς μνήμην Νίκου Οἰκονομίδη*, ed. F. Evangelatou-Notara and T. Maniati-Kokkini (Athens, 2005), 327–45.

53 On the relation of the two men see briefly Kazhdan and Franklin, “Eustathius,” 119–22.

54 Wirth, 131.23–30.

schedographic windings, its very style appeared to me remarkable, not sending the thought of the listener to travel abroad because of the immeasurable extension of its rhetorical figures. Rather, it was a style gathered toward moderation and made alluring by its easy comprehension; it did not make the discourse's countenance utterly wild through the extravagance and obscurity of the riddle, but it both blended the riddle's grimness toward mirth through the flowery quality of its phrases and artfully made the hidden meaning shine along with its external appearance.

This is an important passage because it shows us exactly what Eustathios considered an ideal schedos to be. Michael did not allow this “novel enigmatics” to turn the face of the discourse into something ugly, that is, wild (uncontrolled) and rough (unrefined), as the verb *ἐξαγριῶ* suggests. On the contrary, Michael succeeded through his charming style to reduce the riddle's grimness, while he also made the hidden meaning appear more beautiful.⁵⁵ Thus, Eustathios suggests that Michael produced schedē which in a moderate manner (*μέτριον*) served the aim of the riddle-like grammatical exercise and were pleasing to the pupils. This passage and the one from the letter to Nikephoros complement each other in showing us what constituted the negative and positive quality of “schedographic windings,” a phrase Eustathios used in both passages. If such *σχεδικοί ἐλιγμοί* were left to become linguistic and semantic contortions, which is what recent grammarians did, the resulting excess coarsened unnecessarily the stylistic exterior of the text, while making the riddle so bizarre and obscure that its educational purpose was defeated. Eustathios uses a recurring set of images that reveal his stylistics: clarity, avoidance of excess, pursuit of moderation, blending of opposites, proximity of a text's exterior and interior. In other words, he appears to support a notional “middle state” which should unite all positive qualities of the stylistic spectrum, and to reject all negative qualities.⁵⁶

55 What Eustathios describes here, reflects his comment on *Iliad* 11.101 about subtle deceit in the use of sound plays quoted above, p. 228 and n. 24. Nikephoros Basilakes in the prologue to his collected works (*Praef.* §§3–4; ed. Garzya 3.14–37) also refers to the inner and outer form of the schedos, but his point is very different from Eustathios's here; see briefly Agapitos, “Grammar, Genre and Patronage,” 8–10.

56 On the “middle state,” already strongly promoted by Michael Psellos in the eleventh century, see D. Jenkins, “Psellos' Conceptual



Having looked at Eustathios's differentiated opinions about schedography, we shall proceed in the article's second part to examine his attitude to “everyday language.” Eustathios's critique of contemporary schedographic experimentation in his letter to Nikephoros Komnenos—the error resulting, in his view, from the indiscriminate conflation of three distinct terms into one—is of a particular character because it concerns the survival of the word *καλάνδαι* or *κάλανδα* (in its colloquial form) and the disappearance of the other two learned terms. In the *Parekbolai* to the *Iliad*, he points to another such error concerning the “vernacularization” of a word on account of its use in schedographic riddles. It is the second case of a clearly negative remark against schedography within the *Parekbolai*; Eustathios writes:⁵⁷

“Ὡστε ὁπὸς οὐ τὸ γάλα ἐστίν, ὥς μανθάνουσιν οἱ τρόφιμοι τῶν σχεδικῶν αἰνιγμάτων, οἷα τοῦ ὁποῦ τούτου, καθὰ γάλακτος, παραβδάλοντες ἰδιωτικότερον, ἀλλὰ κυρίως ὁπὸς καλεῖται ἢ τὸν τυρὸν συμπήττουσα πυετία.

So that *opos* (“sap”) is not *gala* (“milk”), as the students of schedographic riddles learn, thus wrongly sucking this *opos* in a rather colloquial manner as if it were *gala*, for *opos* is primarily called the fat juice used to coagulate cheese.

That colloquial usage is meant here (*ὁπὸς* has been given the meaning of *γάλα*), is suggested by the presence of the adverb *ἰδιωτικότερον* (“in a rather colloquial manner”).⁵⁸ The negative image is enforced by the verb *παραβδάλω* (“sucking wrongly”), a creation of Eustathios.⁵⁹ As in the letter to Nikephoros, contemporary schedography appears to distort the correct knowledge of “Attic” Greek. Most importantly, the two passages show us two

Precision,” in *Reading Michael Psellos*, ed. C. Barber and D. Jenkins (Leiden, 2006), 131–51, esp. 142–50.

57 *CommIl.* 619.38–41 to *Il.* 5.902.

58 Van der Valk, 2:lxvii understood the use of *ιδιώτης*, *ιδιωτεία*, *ιδιωτίζω* and *ιδιωτικός* as being always negative. However, a closer examination of all relevant passages in the *Parekbolai* to the *Iliad* (conveniently collected in Keizer, *Indices*, 376) shows that only *ιδιώτης* and *ιδιωτεία* are clearly used with a deprecatory meaning, while *ιδιωτικός* is almost always used descriptively with no negative coloring.

59 See *LBG* 2:1205.

types of “vernacularization” to which Eustathios objects. In the first case, a Latin word (*καλάνδαι*) has lost its specific old meaning and has acquired a new and “wrong” one. In the second case, an old Greek word (*ὀπός*) has been made synonymous to another old word (*γάλα*) which has now “wrongly” become the common word of everyday language. In both cases correct usage is related to the “oldness” of a word and to the attestation of its meaning in time-honored philological manuals, such as commentaries, dictionaries, and grammars.⁶⁰

For Eustathios, however, foreign and thus potentially colloquial words are not by themselves reprehensible, because the presence of “foreign words” (*ἐθνικαὶ λέξεις*) in a language is the result of “intermingling” (*ἐπιμιξία*) between people and languages.⁶¹ For example, while explaining the word *χοῖνιξ* in the *Odyssey* (19.28), Eustathios embarks on an extended discussion of the presence of foreign words in Greek.⁶² He lists a few examples of terms for weights and measures, remarking that “and if *achane* and *achanis* are foreign, they are common words to the Hellenes, not appearing odd at all” (*εἰ δὲ ἐθνικὸν ὄν ἡ ἀχάνη καὶ ἡ ἀχανίς, χρησταὶ εἰσι λέξεις τοῖς Ἑλλήσι, ξενίζον οὐδέν*).⁶³ Adducing a large number of such foreign words in various poets and writers, he concludes:⁶⁴

ὅλως δὲ εἰπεῖν, γέμει διὰ τὰς ἐπιμιξίας μυρίων
ἐθνικῶν λέξεων ἢ Ἑλλὰς γλῶσσα· ὃ περ εἰ καὶ
παρεκβατικῶς τεθεώρηται, ἀλλ’ οὔτε ἀμούσως

60 The third negative comment in the *Parekbolai* to the *Iliad* also concerns a grammatical “innovation” of schedography, this time in respect to the rare verb *ὀπύω* (“to wed a woman”); see *CommIl.* 714.51–53: *Διὸ οὐδὲ κινεῖται ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐνεστῶς εἰς μέλλοντα καὶ τοὺς ἐφεξῆς χρόνους, εἰ καὶ ἡ σχεδὴ τὸ λῆμα ἐθρασύνετο ἐν τῷ ὀπύθῃ, νεωτερισμένη κατὰ τῶν παλαιῶν*. The passive aorist *ὀπύθη* (unattested in the dictionaries) is a “revolution” against ancient practice introduced by schedographic audacity.

61 See P. I. Koukoules, *Θεσσαλονίκης Εὐσταθίου Τὰ γραμματικά* (Athens, 1953), 13–15 for a “de-contextualized” collection of passages with Eustathios’s opinions about everyday language; see also V. Rotolo, “Eustazio di Tessalonica e il greco volgare,” in idem, *Scritti sulla lingua greca antica e moderna*, a cura di R. Lavagnini (Palermo, 2009), 39–54 (originally published in 1984) and S. Fenoglio, “Eustazio di Tessalonica e la lingua del suo tempo,” *Medioevo Greco* 10 (2010): 25–59 (based only on the *Parekbolai* to the *Odyssey*). On cultural and linguistic mixture see Eustathios’s extended digression in *CommOd.* 1398.55–99.10 with a discussion by Cullhed, *Eustathios*, 86*–89*.

62 *CommOd.* 1854.10–38.

63 *CommOd.* 1854.14–15.

64 *CommOd.* 1854.35–38.

ἔχει καὶ οὐδὲ τῆς κατὰ τὴν χοίνικα σκέψεως
ἀπεσχοίνισται, εἰ χρηὴ πάλιν ἐθνικὴν εἰπεῖν λέξιν
ὁποῖα ἡ σχοῖνος ἀφ’ ἧς καὶ τὸ ἀποσχοινίζεσθαι.

All in all, the Hellenic language is filled to the brim owing to the intermingling with myriads of foreign words. And even if this has been examined in a digression, it is neither inappropriate nor separate from the analysis concerning the choinix, should it be necessary to pronounce again a foreign word, such as *schoinos* is, from which *aposchoinizesthai* derives.

Making a wordplay on *χοῖνιξ* and *σχοῖνος*, Eustathios suggests that the fully Attic verb *ἀποσχοινίζω* (here “separate, exclude”) derives from *σχοῖνος* (“rush”), a foreign word. Though the etymology of *schoinos* is unclear, Eustathios was probably influenced by the homonymous Egyptian measure in Herodotus and referred to in the *Suda*.⁶⁵ It is therefore important to note that linguistic mixture is not by itself something odd, if the words used belong to an older substratum of the Greek language.

In a short essay titled *To the One Who Takes It Heavily, though Being a Priest, To Be Called “Papás”* (*Πρὸς τὸν βαρέως ἀκούοντα, εἴπερ ἱερωμένος ὢν καλεῖται παπᾶς*), Eustathios criticizes a cleric of arrogance and ignorance because this person feels insulted when called *παπᾶς*, the colloquial word for *ἱερεύς* (“priest”).⁶⁶ As in the *Parekbolai*, Eustathios here also remarks that words of common usage, even though they might derive from foreign languages, have found their good place among “the speakers of the noble Atthis” (*οἱ τῆς εὐγενούς Ἀτθίδος*).⁶⁷ He further points out that words do undergo phonetic changes;⁶⁸ then, he writes:⁶⁹

Καὶ παραγαγεῖν μὲν γλῶσσαν βάρβαρον τοιούτῳ
σεμνύνουσιν ῥήματι τὸ ἱερατικὸν φύλον, δόξοι ἂν
τοῖς πολλοῖς ἴσως οὐκ εὐάγων. Φαῖεν γὰρ ἂν οὐκ
ἔχειν εὐάγωγῆς, εἴ τις ἐκ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν τὸ πιστὸν
κάνταῦθα εὐοδοῖ· βαρβάροις (-ρους Tafel) γὰρ

65 Herodotus 2.6; *Suda* σ 1812, ed. Adler (n. 25 above), 4:493.9–10.

66 *Opusc.* 6, ed. Tafel (n. 10 above), 37–41.

67 *Opusc.* 6, §8, ed. Tafel, 39.54–5.

68 He gives as an example the word *ἀσταφίς*, “raisin” (*Opusc.* 6, §9, ed. Tafel, 39.72–73): *καθὰ καὶ τὴν ἀσταφίδα ὁσταφίδα λέλεχθαι οἶδαμεν* (“just as I know that the *astaphis* has been called *ostaphis*”).

69 *Opusc.* 6, §§9–10, ed. Tafel, 39.73–90; I have adjusted the punctuation to current practice.

εἴποι ἂν αὐτὸς φωναῖς τὰ σπουδαῖα καθ' Ἑλλήνας συμβιβάζειν, μέμψαιτο ἂν τις. Ἐγὼ δὲ μυρίοις ἔχων ὑποδείγμασιν ἐπιστομίσαι τοὺς τοιούτους, αὐτὸ μὲν ἀφίημι, ἐν μόνον ὑπειπὼν, ὥς πολλὰ τῶν ἄρτι ῥημάτων ἢ ἐκ βαρβάρων εἰς ἡμᾶς καθήκουσιν ἢ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀνεχώρησαν εἰς τὸ βάρβαρον. Ἀναφωνήσω δὲ ὅτι καὶ Ἑλληνικὸν ὄνομα οἱ πόποι ἐπὶ θεοῦ νοήματος· καὶ ὁ βουλόμενος ἐρευνάτω καὶ εὕρισκέτω καὶ κατεχέτω.

Ἐντεῦθεν οὖν ἡρέμα ὑπεγνωσμένου ὥς οὐδέν τι ἀφελὲς καὶ εὐτελὲς καὶ ταπεινὸν καὶ χυδαῖον, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ὁ πάππος, οὐδὲ ὁ πόπος, οὐδὲ μὴν ὁ πάπας δηλοῦσιν, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὁ παπᾶς, ἀλλὰ σεμνὰ εἰσι καὶ θεῖα τὴν σημασίαν.

To introduce a foreign language praising with such a word the priestly race, might seem to many people possibly inappropriate. For they might say that it is not proper conduct, if someone directs the faithful away from the Hellenic language in this matter also. For he could say that someone might censure joining to foreign words what is important according to the Hellenes. But I, having myriads of examples to silence such people, this I shall pass by, saying only one thing: many of the recent words either arrive to us from foreign people or depart from us to foreign lands. Moreover, I shall proclaim that οἱ πόποι is a Hellenic noun⁷⁰ when it concerns a divine concept; and let him who so wishes, search, find and grasp [this matter].

Having then somewhat comprehended henceforth that just as *páppos*, *pópos* and even *pápas* do not characterize something naive, cheap, humble and vulgar, so does not *papás*; indeed, these words are solemn and holy as to their meaning.

The whole passage is highly telling of Eustathios's attitude to language. He accepts mixture as something "natural," while he views mobility between languages as something "regular." It is particularly interesting to note that this linguistic mobility refers to recent times as the adverb ἄρτι qualifying ῥημάτων clearly suggests.

70 Eustathios in *CommIl.* 98.45–48 explains the use of ὁ πόποι instead of ὁ θεός with a reference to posthomeric usage, an oblique reference to Lycophron's *Alexandra* 943 (see van der Valk [n. 20 above], 1:155 *ad locum*).

It is the same adverb Eustathios had used to define temporally the transgression of the grammarians in his letter on *calendae*. In both cases, colloquial words are concerned. Thus, colloquial discourse was by itself not necessarily damnable for Eustathios. It is the context of its use that caused his concern.

In his letters and speeches Eustathios will, in fact, use words of the "humble language" in order to gloss an "Attic" word or to introduce a philological exegesis in contexts related to various *realia* of everyday life. The gloss usually appears as part of an ironic or even flatly sarcastic comment,⁷¹ while the exegesis is mostly employed in literary play. For example, in another letter addressed to Nikephoros Komnenos, Eustathios excuses his humble gift of a particular variety of grapes:⁷²

ὁρᾷς γάρ, ὅπως εἰς τοσοῦτον δραπετής τὰ εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ χρυσός, ὥς μὴδὲ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ παρωνυμουμένην ὀπώραν ἀφείναι παρ' ἡμῖν εἶναι· ἀλλ' ἀντ' αὐτῆς ἐκπεπέμφθαι τῇ σῇ μεγαλυπερόχῳ λαμπρότητι σταφυλᾷς μὲν καὶ ταύτας· οὐ μὴν καὶ χρυσᾶς, ὅποια τὰ ἐν ὑποσχέσει. φθονεραὶ γὰρ καὶ αὗται καὶ φυγάδες ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸν ἐπιστατοῦντα τῇ σφῶν κλήσει χρυσόν. οὐκ οὖν ἡμῖν σταφυλαὶ αὗται χρυσαῖ, εἶδους δέ τινος ἑτεροῦ· ἃς ἡ χύδην ῥέουσα γλῶσσα κουκούβας καλεῖ· ταῦτόν δὲ γλαῦκας εἰπεῖν· καὶ οἶμαι διὰ τὸ τοῦ χρώματος ὁμοιον καὶ (ὥς ἂν εἴπῃ τις) γλαυκωπόν· ὑπογλαυκίζουσι γὰρ καὶ αὐταί, ὅτε τις αὐτὰς τὸ πρῶτον δρέψεται, καθάπερ οὖν ἐκεῖναι κερράζουσι καὶ δι' αὐτὸ αὗται μὲν ἐπωνυμίαν κληροῦνται γλαυκός, ἐκεῖναι δὲ διὰ τὸ κερρὸν τοῦ χρώματος ἐπονομάζονται τῷ χρυσῷ.

You see, then, to what an extent gold flees from me, so much so that it does not allow the fruit deriving from its name to stay with me. Instead of this fruit, I have sent to your illustrious magnificence grapes as well, but not golden ones, as the fruit I had promised. For these are mischievous and fugitives from me just like the gold that oversees their appellation. Thus, these my grapes

71 For example, σεμνύνεται δὲ μετὰ γε τὸ λευκὸν χρῶμα καὶ φαισφόρον τὸ ἐρυθρὸν εἶτ' οὖν κόκκινον (*De vita monastica* §105.2–3, ed. Metzler [n. 9 above], 116) or εἰ γοῦν ἀποδυσπετεῖς, βάσταξε μηκέτι σταυρόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῶπον εἶτ' οὖν φόρτον πραγματευτικὸν κάτω βαρύνοντα (*De vita monastica* §43.2–3, ed. Metzler, 52); for a selection of such glosses see Koukoules, *Tὰ γραμματικά*, 21–23.

72 *Ep.* 3. 10–22, ed. Kolovou, 7.

are not golden, but of another kind, which the disorderly flowing language calls *koukoubai*—I suppose identical to saying *glaukes* [sc. “owls”] because of the color being the same and (one might say) greyish. For the latter grapes are also lightly blue-greyish when they are first reaped, just as the former are yellowish. Because of this the latter have been allotted the appellation of an owl, while the former because of their yellowish color are named after gold.

The letter is an expression of thanks for the patron’s support. The absence of gold in Eustathios’s household does not even allow him to send to Nikephoros “golden” grapes, so he is forced to offer as a gift a variety of “owl-colored” ones.⁷³ While the “golden” variety is not described through a specific word,⁷⁴ the other variety is clearly identified through the colloquial word *κουκούβαι*. Eustathios explains this word as being identical to *γλαῦκες* (“owls”), therefore, these grapes must be of some blue-grey variety.⁷⁵ Eustathios introduces the colloquial word with the phrase “the disorderly flowing language.”⁷⁶ One might be tempted to interpret this explicatory formula as signaling a negative attitude toward colloquial discourse. However, in the *Parekbolai* to the *Odyssey*, Eustathios uses this particular colloquial word in order to explain σκῶψ (*Od.* 5.66) as a kind of owl by stating that “*skopes* appear to be what the Romans call *koukoubai*” (καὶ δοκοῦσι σκῶπες εἶναι ὅς κουκούβας οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι

φασίν).⁷⁷ The explicatory formula of the high-style letter to the learned patron appears in the teacher’s philological notes as a simple reference to the “Romans,” that is, the Byzantines.⁷⁸ Therefore, it is the context of the use of everyday words and the addressee of a text that play an important part in coloring Eustathios’s tone of characterizing colloquial discourse.

It should be pointed out here that the negative terminology describing literary or linguistic phenomena found in authors of the Middle Byzantine period is both an inheritance and a potential attitude that goes back to the acceptance of the normative grammatical-rhetorical system of Hellenic education during the Roman Empire.⁷⁹ This acceptance, however, does not presuppose that such terms are used by Byzantine intellectuals with the same meaning as in their original context.⁸⁰ The Byzantines would not invent a neutral “scientific” term for something already found in older authorities, though new terms for modern inventions are neutral, for example, *kontakion*, *politikos stichos* or

73 See A. Karpozelos, “Realia in Byzantine Epistolography X–XII c.,” *BZ* 77 (1984): 20–37, esp. 22 on grapes as gifts and the *κουκούβαι* of *Ep.* 3.

74 P. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινὴ βίος καὶ πολιτισμός*, 6 vols. (Athens, 1948–55), 5:106 proposes to identify these with a variety called in Modern Greek *χρυσοστάφυλα*.

75 Ibid., 5:105 identifies these with a reddish-grey variety called in Modern Greek *γλαῦκα*. In Ancient Greek, however, the color *γλαυκός* is explained as “blue-grey” (Pl. *Tim.* 68c) and is so used for blue grapes (e.g., Soph. *Trach.* 703).

76 For a list of such “negative” formulaic phrases defining colloquial discourse see Koukoules, *Τὰ γραμματικά*, 15 and 17, for example, *CommIl.* 295.28 ἰδιωτικὴ παραφθορά (“colloquial corruption”), *CommIl.* 664.43 παράκοπος ὁμιλία (“falsified speech”), *CommIl.* 1188.62 χυδαία γλώσσα (“vulgar usage”), *CommOd.* 1358.56 παραφθορά (“corruption”). On how problematic the generalizing negative interpretation of such formulaic phrases is see P. A. Agapitos, “Anna Komnene and the Politics of Schedographic Training and Colloquial Discourse,” *Νέα Πώμη* 10 (2013 [2014]): 89–107, esp. 95–98.

77 *CommOd.* 1523.57; see *LBG* 1:871 s.v. *κουκούβα* and *κουκουβία* (with many references).

78 From the material in Keizer, *Indices* (n. 20 above), 64 it appears that when Ῥωμαῖος explains a “recent” word, it means “Byzantine,” when used in conjunction with historical explanations it means “Roman.”

79 See, for example, the brief presentation in R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1983), 44–50 with a selection of negative terms from Phrynichos’s *Ecloga* to describe deviations from an Atticist norm. Furthermore, see Phryn. *Ecl.* μιᾶρόν (41), παράλογον (50), διεφθαρμένως (70), ἰδιώτης (184), βάρβαρον (307), ἀλλόκοτον (329); the numbers refer to the lemmata in the critical edition of E. Fischer, *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos* (Berlin, 1974). An instructive example of critique against Atticist prescriptions is Lucian’s dialogue *Lexiphanes*. Lykinos (the author’s *persona*) offers to Lexiphanes (an aspiring writer of a pure Attic style and strict follower of Atticist dictionaries) a series of advice on correct and elegant Attic style (*Lex.* §§22–25, in *Luciani Opera*, ed. M. D. Macleod, 4 vols. [Oxford, 1972–87], 3:67–69); the passage includes much negative terminology and examples similar to the ones used by Phrynichos.

80 In his detailed analysis of Eustathios’s negative terms to describe colloquial discourse van der Valk, 2:lxxxvi–lxxxviii (§168) has been misled in understanding all such phrases as expressing a general negative attitude toward the *καθωμυλημένη γλώσσα* (*CommIl.* 1266.43). A similar use of negative terminology to describe linguistic phenomena without any negative coloring is found in the exemplary case of Sanskrit and its normative philology (grammars, commentaries, dictionaries) when applied to the non-grammaticized vernacular “languages of Place” (*desibhasa*), such as early vernacular Kannada (fifth–ninth century); see S. Pollock, *The Language of Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture and Power in Premodern India* (Berkeley, 2006), 89–114 (Sanskrit) and 298–318 (languages of Place).

schedos. Let us look, therefore, at one of Eustathios's most explicitly negative remarks concerning everyday language.

At the point where he has been arrested during the capture of Thessalonike by the Normans in the summer of 1185, Eustathios is taken along with his fellow prisoners to the ship of the renegade Alexios Komnenos.⁸¹ After a confrontation with what was probably a Norman soldier with his brother,⁸² Eustathios is left to rest for the night. He continues:⁸³

Καὶ διαγαγόντες ἐκεῖ μετὰ τῶν συναιχμαλώτων
ἡμέρας ὀλίγας, καὶ τι καὶ ἐλεηθέντες εἰς τροφήν,
ναὶ δὲ ὑπὸ τινος τῶν ἐκείνου καὶ εἰς χαλκέα
κέρματα, ὧν ἡ δόσις ἡμῖν τηλικαῦτα εἰς θησαυροὺς
ἐνεγράφη Κροίσου (καὶ ἐλεῆσαι ὁ Θεὸς τὸν
ἄνθρωπον), εἶτα καὶ εἰς τοὺς κόντους, εἰπεῖν δὲ
συνηθέστερον κόμητας (μισῶ γὰρ τὸ ἀκράτως
βάρβαρον) ἐκομίσθημεν.

I passed a few days there with my fellow captives and was granted the mercy of a little food; indeed, I was even given a few bronze coins by one of his men (and may God be merciful to that man!), a gift which for me was registered among the treasures of Kroisos. Then I was brought before the *conti*, or *comites* as they should be more usually called—for I detest the unblended foreign usage.

After what we have seen so far, we can better understand the negative interjection Eustathios makes. He was taken to the Norman counts, whom he calls τοὺς κόντους, a Hellenized plural accusative of the Italian *conte*. He adds, however, that more usually one would call such persons κόμητες, that is, the older Latin and Byzantine military

term.⁸⁴ Therefore, his remark “for I detest the unblended foreign usage” implies that he disliked the use of a recent, blatantly foreign word, but did not object to an older one that has been blended over centuries into the Greek language.⁸⁵ As in some of his other remarks, this shows a clearly conservative but not generally negative attitude toward everyday language. Therefore, it should not surprise us that in certain contexts he will openly use colloquial words or short phrases.

Eustathios wrote a sermon *On Hypocrisy* (Περὶ ὑποκρίσεως), delivered in Thessalonike at some point after the city's capture.⁸⁶ Toward the end of the text, he

84 On κόντος and κόμης in the meaning of “feudal count” in the twelfth century see *LBG* 1:860 and 852 (with good bibliography). Niketas Choniates introduces in his *History* (*Nicetae Choniatae historia*, ed. J. L. van Dieten [Berlin, 1975], 296–308) a “digression” on the capture of Thessalonike by the Normans. Having reached the end of the account, Niketas offers a brief praise of Eustathios as bishop of the fallen city, especially his effort to alleviate the people's suffering by negotiating with the Norman warlords. The passage unmistakably echoes Eustathios: Οὐκοῦν καὶ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ὀπτανόμενος, οὓς κόντους εἶπη τις ἂν Λατίνῃ διαλέκτῳ χρώμενος, ἐμετρίαζε τὰ χεῖρω τοῖς πεπονθόσιν ἐπιτάγματα (van Dieten, 308.1–3). Niketas first uses a standard Greek term and then glosses it with its foreign contemporary equivalent, being the term Eustathios had used but disliked.

85 In the available modern translations of the work Eustathios's interjection has been consistently misunderstood, because, on the one hand, the adverb ἀκράτως was perceived as meaning “utterly” in an evaluative scale, rather than “unblended” in a literary-stylistic scale, and, on the other hand, the adjective βάρβαρον was interpreted as “barbaric” in a pejorative sense, rather than “foreign” with no negative shade attached to it; see Kyriakidis and Rotolo, *La espugnazione di Tessalonica* (n. 9 above), 111 (“non posso sopportare i solecismi usati nella forma originaria”); Melville-Jones, *Eustathios*, 111 (“since I detest the excessively barbarian form of this word”); Ἰωάννης Καμινιάτης—Εὐστάθιος Θεσσαλονίκης—Ἰωάννης Ἀναγνώστης, *Χρονικά τῶν Ἀλώσεων τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης*, trans. C. Messis, introduction and notes P. Odorico (Athens, 2009), 269 (“ἂν καὶ μισῶ νὰ χρησιμοποιῶ χωρὶς μέτρο ὅρους βαρβαρικούς”); *Die Normannen in Thessalonike: Die Eroberung von Thessalonike durch die Normannen (1185 n. Chr.) in der Augenzeugenschilderung des Bischofs Eustathios*, trans. H. Hunger (Graz, 1955), 105 (“der rein barbarische Ausdruck ist mir zuwider”).

86 *Opusc.* 13, ed. Tafel, 88–98. That the text was a sermon can be inferred from the address to a congregation (*Hypocr.* §13, ed. Tafel 91.43 ὡ ἀδελφοί), the blessing at the end (§39, ed. Tafel, 98.55–56), and a strong moralizing perspective, despite the philological analysis of *hypokrisia* as acting on the ancient stage (§§1–7, ed. Tafel, 88.5–89.56). The sermon was certainly delivered after the *Examination of Monastic Life* (ca. 1180–85; Metzler, *Untersuchungen*, 23–244), since Eustathios, while talking about hypocritical monks and their active participation in profitable activities, interrupts his analysis and refers to “other writings” where he has presented this topic (§35, ed. Tafel, 96.88–90). Only the *Examination* can be meant here as can be seen from the similar

81 This person is most probably the protostrator Alexios, son of Andronikos Komnenos Vatatzes; see Barzos, *Γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν* (n. 40 above), 2:390–91 (Alexios K. no. 237) and J. R. Melville-Jones, *Eustathios of Thessaloniki: The Capture of Thessaloniki; A Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Canberra, 1988), 234–35.

82 The soldier's name is Γιλῆλμος and he curses loudly in a foreign language: ἀνάθεμα πρὸς βοὴν συχνὰ ἐβαρβάριζε (*CaptThessal.* §94, ed. Kyriakidis [n. 9], 110.1).

83 *CaptThessal.* §95, ed. Kyriakidis, 110.13–18; translation quoted from Melville-Jones, *Eustathios*, 111 with modifications.

criticized the type of non-cenobitic and unruly ascetic monk who had become quite popular in the empire's cities, though despised by the official church.⁸⁷ To make his point clear about the hypocrisy of these people, Eustathios tells a story that took place during the reign of John II Komnenos (r. 1118–1143), and of which he had personal experience. It is about the hypocritical conduct of a supposed ascetic who finds a disgusting way to show that his flesh truly suffered from his austere bodily exertions. The story is introduced as follows:⁸⁸

Ἐμοὶ δὲ ἔπεισι μνησθέντι καὶ τι γελοῖον εἰς πλεόν
ἐκθέσθαι φάκτον τοιόνδε, εἰς πείραν ἐληλυθὸς
πλατεῖαν ἣν ὅτε τοῖς Μεγαλοπολίταις, ὃ καὶ ἡμᾶς
ἐκπλήξαν παρέμεινε εἰς μνήμην διηνεκῇ.

This came to me as I remembered to present to you in more detail a funny event such as it had become broadly known to the inhabitants of the Great City, which event, having astonished me as well, remained for ever in my memory.

The monk, who had bound his body with iron fetters, chopped up the lung of an animal almost to pulp and inserted it under his cloak, there where the fetters touched his skin. Once a visitor had arrived, the pious ascetic pretended to suffer from pain. Eustathios continues:⁸⁹

Εἶτα τὴν χεῖρα καθιεὶς ἔνδον, ὅποι τὸν πνεύμονα
ἐκεῖνον κατέχρισε, καὶ κνησάμενος ἐξῆγε τὴν
ἐξάριστον ὑπουργὸν εἰς φῶς καὶ ἐπιφωνήσας
ὀδυνηρῶς τὸ τὰ κρέατά μου, διετίνασσεν αὐτὴν
πρὸς τέχνην.

Then, driving his hand inside, there where he had smeared out that lung, and scratching

treatment of the topic (i.e., hypocritical behavior of monks) in *Exam.* §§26–27, 34–35, 57–67, 117–25.

87 On this type of figure see more broadly P. Magdalino, “The Byzantine Holy Man in the Twelfth Century,” in *The Byzantine Saint: University of Birmingham, 14th Spring Symposium*, ed. S. Hackel (London, 1981), 51–66 (reprinted in P. Magdalino, *Tradition and Transformation in Medieval Byzantium* [Aldershot, 1991], no. VII); on this figure in Eustathios see Metzler, *Untersuchungen* (n. 9 above), 46–49 and 200–212.

88 *Hypocr.* §36, ed. Tafel, 97.30–33.

89 *Hypocr.* §36, ed. Tafel, 97.55–59.

himself, he brought out to the light his accursed servant [i.e., his hand] and, shouting painfully “oh my meat!,” he shook it artfully.

The story has a grotesque quality quite similar to a number of scenes in the Ptochoprodromic poems.⁹⁰ The opening and the end of the short narrative are marked by two “vernacular” words: the old legal technical term φάκτον (“event, occurrence”) and the exclamation τὰ κρέατά μου (a plural form of κρέας that is not “Attic”).⁹¹ Neither words are glossed by Eustathios, but are left to stand alone for their particular effect, judicial truth in the former case, colloquial documentation in the latter. The story is specifically signaled as “funny” (γελοῖον), making it clear that the use of everyday language and the brief switch of stylistic register—a clear case of *epimixia*—is part of a humorous discourse similar to a number of passages in the “learned” works of John Tzetzes and Theodore Prodromos.⁹² In other words, Eustathios will use everyday language for stylistic effect, not rejecting it altogether, but employing it according to his particular concept of stylistic blend.



It seems that Eustathios's fine stylistic differentiation on the use of the ἰδιώτις γλῶσσα was not necessarily understood or even approved by some of his contemporaries. There survives a rare testimony on Eustathios's use of language in his daily conversations. It is a comment related to a presentation of his impact as a speaker,

90 *Ptochopr.* 1.102–12, ed. H. Eideneier, *Πτωχοπρόδρομος: Κριτική έκδοση* (Herakleion, 2012), 156 (the narrator scratching his own leprous skin and getting involved with the vulgar daughter of a tavern-keeper); 1.206–20, ed. Eideneier, 159–60 (the narrator steals food from the kitchen of his own house, while one of his children has had an apparently fatal accident); 3.145–55, ed. Eideneier, 181 (the narrator's failed attempt to become a cobbler by piercing his hand with a sharp awl); 4.355–87, ed. Eideneier, 218–20 (the narrator describes the infamous “holy broth” served at Philotheou monastery).

91 Eustathios also uses φάκτον in one of his introductory homilies to Lent (*or.* 4; 94.290, ed. Schönauer), where he wishes to narrate a peculiar story about the palm in an allegorical interpretation of an episode from the life of the martyr Nikephoros.

92 See, for example, Tzetzes, *Chil.* 11.210–24 (in *Ioannis Tzetzæ historiae*, ed. P. A. M. Leone [Naples, 1968], 438; *Chil.* 12.157–62, ed. Leone 474; *Chil.* 12.223–32, ed. Leone 476; Prodromos, *schedos* no. 8 (ed. Papadimitriou, *Feodor Prodrom* [n. 11 above], 433–35) and *schedos* no. 18 (ed. Polemis, “Προβλήματα” [n. 11 above], 287–302).

and it comes from the archbishop of Athens Michael Choniates (ca. 1138–1222), an old pupil of Eustathios and himself an acclaimed man of letters.⁹³ In one of his sermons, delivered between 1195 and 1198 to his Athenian congregation,⁹⁴ Michael included a digression on the recently deceased metropolitan of Thessalonike.⁹⁵ In this digression Michael focused on two aspects of Eustathios as an exceptional, divinely inspired teacher. These aspects were his actual teaching at school and his preaching at church. Both had miraculous effects on the recipients, since his students were promptly led to knowledge, while the members of his congregation were immediately led to moral betterment. As to Eustathios as a teacher, Michael writes:⁹⁶

Ἐκεῖνος γάρ, ἵνα μικρόν τι καὶ ὡς ἐπιτροχάδην τοῖς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐντροφήσω καλοῖς, ἔρωτι σοφίας καὶ ἀρετῆς ἐκκαυθεῖς, ἴδιος μὲν εἶναι τὴν τοῦ λόγου ιδέαν ἡγάπησε· τῷ τοι οὐδ' ἡνείχετο μὴ οὐ κεκομψευμένως καὶ γλαφυρῶς φράζειν τὰ καθωμιλημένα καὶ τὰ γλίσχρα πολυτελῶς καὶ τὰ φαῦλα μεγαλοπρεπῶς καὶ σεμνῶς· τὸν δὲ βίον, καίπερ καινὸν ὄντα καὶ αὐτόν, ἐν τῷ κοινῷ καὶ συνήθει προβλήματι συνέκρυπτε, τῷ μὲν φαινομένῳ μηδὲν τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων δοκεῖν διαφέρειν ἐσπουδακῶς, ὑπὲρ δὲ τοὺς πολλοὺς εἶναι τῷ κρυπτομένῳ φιλοτιμούμενος. . . .

Καινοτέρως γὰρ καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔτι βιοτεύων ἐθαυματουργεῖ ταυτί, πολλοῖς μὲν ἀνάπτων ἐπιστήμης καὶ γνώσεως ὅμματα πτύσασιν καὶ μόνοις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδασκαλικοῦ στόματος,

πολλοῖς δὲ γλώττας βαρβάρους μεταρρυθμίζων ταῖς παρ' ἑαυτοῦ τεχνολογίαις καὶ τοῖς τοῦ ἀττικίζειν διδάγμασιν, ὅλοις δὲ ἀκροατηρίοις κωφοῖς ἐμφυτεύων ὦτα εὐμαθέστερον ἐπαῖοντα καὶ ξυναρπάζοντα φρενὶ τὰ φωνούμενα.

Let me indulge briefly and summarily in the good qualities of the man. For he, having been inflamed by the love of wisdom and virtue, desired to be unique in respect to the form of his discourse. Therefore, he could not even bear not to formulate everyday speech elegantly and smoothly, nor to express trivial things in a lavish style and petty things in a grandiloquent and splendid diction. As to his conduct in life, although it was also quite novel, he hid it inside our common and conventional cover, making an effort not to seem to differ at all from most people as to his apparent exterior, yet striving eagerly to be superior to most as to his hidden interior. . . .

While still living among us, he would paradoxically even perform miracles in the following manner: for many pupils he illuminated their eyes with understanding and knowledge by means of just the spittle of his divine and educative mouth, for many students he reformed their uncouth speech by means of his systematical grammatical expositions and his teachings of proper Attic diction, while to wholly deaf audiences he implanted ears comprehending swiftly and grasping fully with their minds what was being said.

Michael used two hagiographical conventions to praise his deceased teacher within the context of a sermon. Through the first convention he pointed to the “double” character of Eustathios, whose hidden interior was morally superior to most people, though his exterior appeared to be quite conventional. It is an old encomiastic motif signaling the character of a saintly person, and Eustathios himself had used it to praise the deceased archbishop of Athens Nikolaos Hagiotheodorites (†1175).⁹⁷ Needless to say, Choniates formulates the motif by varying the “innovation-as-imitation” concept,

93 See F. Kolovou, *Μιχαὴλ Χωνιάτης: Συμβολὴ στὴ μελέτη τοῦ βίου καὶ τοῦ ἔργου του. Τὸ corpus τῶν ἐπιστολῶν* (Athens, 1999), 9–23 with the older bibliography.

94 See Arsenij, *Cetyre neizdannyyja besedy Michaila Akominata mitropolita Afinskago, grečeskij tekst i russkij perevod* (Novgorod, 1901), 234–89, which I was not able to consult.

95 The specific passage was reedited by S. P. Lambros, “Χωρίον Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου περὶ Εὐσταθίου Θεσσαλονίκης,” *Νέος Ἑλλ.* 13 (1916): 359–61. Michael Choniates also composed a separate monody on Eustathios; see S. P. Lambros, *Μιχαὴλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ σωζόμενα*, 2 vols. (Athens, 1879–80), 1:283–306. There survives also a monody on Eustathios by his friend and former fellow student Euthymios Malakes; see T. L. F. Tafel, *De Thessalonica eiusque agro dissertatio geographica* (Berlin, 1839), 394–400 and K. G. Bonis, *Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη μητροπολίτου Νέων Πατρῶν (Υπάτης) τὰ σωζόμενα* (Athens, 1937), 78–83.

96 Lambros, “Χωρίον,” 360 and 361. The passage has been briefly commented upon by Koukoules, *Τὰ γραμματικά* (n. 61 above), 24.

97 *OpMin.* 1, ed. Wirth, 13.71–14.87; see also the edition by A. Sideras, 25 *unedierte byzantinische Grabreden* (Thessalonike, 1990), 47.9–27.

as can be seen from the appearance of the key word *καινός* (“novel”) to describe the hidden moral life of Eustathios.⁹⁸ The second convention Choniates employs concerns Eustathios’s inspired teaching at school. This discursive activity displaying divine wisdom is presented as “miracle-working” (*ἐθαυματουργεῖ*). “Paradoxically” (*καινοτέρως*), Michael points out, such miracles were performed while Eustathios was still alive; they are yet another sign of holiness.⁹⁹

It is within this hagiographical praise of an archbishop, who was an important teacher, that we have to interpret Michael’s remark on Eustathios’s use of language in *τὰ καθωμιλημένα* (“everyday speech”).¹⁰⁰ While Michael, therefore, applies as archbishop the hagiographical concept of the “double” character to Eustathios the archbishop, Michael as philologist applies to the teacher Eustathios the philosophic concept of “uniqueness.”¹⁰¹ Eustathios is presented as having “desired to be unique as to the form of his discourse” (*ἴδιος μὲν εἶναι τὴν τοῦ λόγου ἰδέαν ἡγάπησε*). It is on account of this aspiration toward discursive uniqueness—that is, complete identity of the whole and its parts in a unique form—that in his daily speech he would use even for trivial matters the most elegant and grand style.¹⁰² Thus, we are faced with an encomium blending two different traditions—Christian and

Hellenic—about the essence of human character. The images drawn by Michael Choniates are exact and make perfect sense, even if we cannot be certain that they reflect “reality,” though they certainly reflect Choniates’ interpretive “truth.” In fact, there are a few indications which suggest that Eustathios could very well converse in the everyday language when it came to such matters as saving his life from Norman soldiers or cursing the prophet Muhammad at a formal meeting of the Holy Synod.¹⁰³

The broader and contextualized analysis of a number of passages in Eustathios’s works concerning schedography and everyday language makes it obvious that the highly educated master of orators and archbishop had a fairly clear concept about the potentials and the limitations of schedography, as well as about the use of colloquial discourse. This concept included schedography as part of “general education” (*ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία*) but it excluded any form of excess, especially in matters of linguistic (*qua* literary) innovation by the use of everyday language in an inappropriate (*qua* exhibitionist) manner. In this respect, Eustathios held similar views to those of Anna Komnene when she was expressing her objections to “immoral activities” within educational practice around the middle of the twelfth century.¹⁰⁴ More specifically, Eustathios’s critique of “cannibalistic” schedography needs to be read within Komnenian literary polemics that were intimately connected to the capital’s highly competitive educational environment.¹⁰⁵ In the second half of the century this trend developed into a full-scale stylistic shift among high-standing literati such as Anna Komnene, Nikephoros Basilakes, Eustathios, George and Demetrios Tornikes, and Michael and

98 The same motif of a “double” nature is used by Malakes, *MonEusth.* §4, ed. Tafel, *De Thessalonica*, 398 (*καὶ μέγας μὲν ἐντὸς . . . ἔξωθεν δὲ μικρός τε*).

99 There is, of course, an immense tradition of posthumous miracles, as well as a tradition for miracles performed by saints while they were still alive, but this latter tradition is almost exclusively found in the early Byzantine period. Saints of the middle and late Byzantine periods almost never performed this type of miracle. The use of this convention by Michael suggests that the tradition has moved into the domain of rhetoric as an encomiastic convention for high officials of the Church.

100 Eustathios uses the adverb *καθωμιλημένως* to characterize the colloquial word *ἐκουσιακούσιοι* (*CaptThessal.* §124, ed. Kyriakidis, 138.18).

101 On “uniqueness” and “sameness” in Plato and, then, Gregory the Theologian, see S. Papaioannou, “Gregory and the Constraint of Sameness,” in *Gregory of Nazianzus: Images and Reflections*, ed. J. Bortnes and T. Hägg (Copenhagen, 2006), 59–81.

102 Choniates, *MonEusth.* §23, ed. Lambros, 1:292.28–293.4, elaborates this extremely dense remark. Choniates’ point here is not that Eustathios cultivated a laudible incongruity in style by making small things great or the reverse; see Cullhed, *Eustathios*, 76*–79* on Eustathios praising this stylistic effect in Homer. Choniates, *MonEusth.* §21, ed. Lambros, 1:291.29–292.4, presents Eustathios as objecting strongly to this device in the composition of prose rhetoric, especially when colloquial discourse is tastelessly “translated” into

high style, exactly what Lexiphanes was doing in Lucian’s dialogue (see above n. 79).

103 See *CaptThessal.* §94, ed. Kyriakidis, 108.26–110.10 (Norman soldier) and NikChon. *Hist.* 216.29–217.33 van Dielen (cursing Muhammad).

104 *Alexiad* 15.7.9, ed. Reinsch and Kambylis 485.22–25; see, in more detail, Agapitos, “Anna Komnene,” 92–101.

105 See A. Garzya, “Literarische und rhetorische Polemiken der Komnenenzeit,” *BSI* 34 (1973): 1–14 (repr. in idem, *Storia e interpretazione di testi bizantini: Saggi e ricerche* [London, 1974], no. VII) for a first assessment. For two textual witnesses of such polemics see M. Loukaki, “Τυμβωρύχοι και σκυλευτές νεκρών: Οι απόψεις του Νικολάου Καταφλώρον για τη ρητορική και τους ρήτορες στην Κωνσταντινούπολη του 12^{ου} αιώνα,” *Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα* 14 (2001): 143–66 and A. Sideras, *Eine byzantinische Invektive gegen die Verfasser von Grabreden* (Vienna, 2002).

Niketas Choniates. These authors developed a complex, apparently classicizing but in practice quite Byzantine style of Greek, which, of course, remains to be studied.¹⁰⁶ It is the attitude of this specific group of intellectuals that Michael Choniates' characterization of Eustathios encapsulates in an almost programmatic manner. The cultivation of a literary Hellenic image among this closely connected circle was extremely pronounced, and various hypotheses have been put forward to explain this phenomenon.¹⁰⁷ However, since this circle was very

106 For a series of important studies concerning both learned and vernacular Greek in Byzantium see M. Hinterberger, "Το φαινόμενο της πολυτυπίας σε δημόσια κείμενα," in *Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημόσιας γραμματείας: Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Neograeca Medii Aevi IV*^a, ed. H. Eideneier and U. Moennig and N. Toufexis (Herakleion, 2001), 215–44; idem, "How Should We Define Vernacular Literature," in *Unlocking the Potential of Texts: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Medieval Greek*, Cambridge 2006 (see <http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek/unlocking/html/Hinterberger.html>, accessed 15 March 2015); idem, "Die Sprache der byzantinischen Literatur: Der Gebrauch der synthetischen Plusquamperfektformen," in *Byzantinische Sprachkunst: Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Hinterberger and E. Schiffer (Berlin, 2007), 107–42. For a first broader appreciation of learned Greek as a linguistic system see now the studies collected in *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature*, ed. M. Hinterberger (Turnhout, 2014).

107 R. Macrides and P. Magdalino, "The Fourth Kingdom and the Rhetoric of Hellenism," in *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. P. Magdalino (London, 1992), 117–56; P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180* (Cambridge, 1993), 382–412; A. Kaldellis, *Hellenism in Byzantium: The Transformations of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, 2007), 225–316; idem, "Classical Scholarship in Twelfth-Century Byzantium," in *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*, ed. C. Barber and D. Jenkins (Leiden, 2009), 1–43; M. D. Lauxtermann, "La poesia," in *Lo spazio letterario del Medioevo*, part 3: *Le culture circostanti*, vol. 1: *La cultura bizantina*, ed. G. Cavallo (Rome, 2004), 301–48,

small, the literary, philological, and theological output of its members represents only a small part of textual production between 1150 and 1220. We can also observe that the remarks concerning everyday language within this group vary, from Nikephoros Basilakes' complete rejection to Eustathios's acceptance of a moderate use in stylistic blends and for specific purposes.¹⁰⁸

Eustathios's remarks on schedography and everyday language allow us to draw a substantially differentiated and far more complex picture of his ideas than older scholarship had been able to do. The foregoing analysis has also shown that the interpretive models about "high" and "low" education and language used since the time of Karl Krumbacher are not functional any more and need to be replaced if the study of Byzantine literature is to be conducted within a broader, theoretically informed framework that will be based on the new, but still diffuse, insights of recent Byzantinist scholarship.

Department of Byzantine and
Modern Greek Studies
University of Cyprus
P.O. Box 20537
Nicosia 1678
p.a.agapitos@ucy.ac.cy

esp. 327–35. For a sober critique of some of the opinions expressed in the previous studies see now I. Stouraitis, "Roman Identity in Byzantium: A Critical Approach," *BZ* 107 (2014): 175–220.

108 See Basilakes' remark in his preface (*praef.* §12, ed. Garzya, 7.17–21): ὥς ἡ λέξις εὖσημος παρὰ πᾶσι καὶ τὸ τῆς σαφηνείας ὑπαυγάζουσα φῶς, ἐκπέφυγε δὲ καὶ τὸ κοινὸν καὶ ὥς ἐν τριόδῳ περιημαζευμένον· τριοδίτις γὰρ λέξις καὶ καταπεπατημένη ἀπαιδευσίαν κατηγορεῖ καὶ ἰδιωτισμὸν ῥήτορος ("since his vocabulary was well-received by everybody and made the light of his stylistic clarity shine forth, while it avoided the common idiom, worn-out, so to speak, at the crossroads; for such an overtrodden vocabulary of the crossroad denounces an orator's lack of education and amateurishness").

THE PRESENT ARTICLE IS A SUBSTANTIALLY revised version of a paper given at a symposium on Eustathios of Thessalonike hosted by Ingela Nilsson and Eric Cullhed at the University of Uppsala in October 2013. The research for the paper was for the most part conducted at the Institute of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies of the University of Munich with a grant

from the A. C. Leventis Foundation (London). I am grateful to both institutions for their support. Thanks are due to Diether Roderich Reinsch for providing me with rare bibliographical items, and to Eric Cullhed and Martin Hinterberger for their insightful comments on a number of crucial points. Except where otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.

